UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/735,512	12/12/2003	Salman Al-Mahmood	1414-03	6845
	7590 03/28/200 DLA PIPER US LLP	EXAMINER		
ONE LIBERTY	<del>-</del> -	MCGARRY, SEAN		
PHILADELPH	ST, SUITE 4900 IA, PA 19103		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1635	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/28/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/735,512	AL-MAHMOOD, SALMAN		
Examiner	Art Unit		

	Sean R. McGarry	1635	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>14 March 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperfor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavited al (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 5 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the Notice of Appeal has been filed.</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
<u>AMENDMENTS</u> 3.	out prior to the data of filing a brief	will not be entered be	causo
a) ∑ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to (a) ∑ They raise new issues that would require further cor			cause
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	•	,,	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in beti	ter form for appeal by materially red	ducing or simplifying th	ne issues for
appeal; and/or			
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c	-	ected claims.	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1	,		
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	·	•	_
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proven the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an ex	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: <u>none</u> . Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,3,4,6,19,20,26 and 27</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 7-18 and 21-25.			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
10.  ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Sean R McGarry/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1635	
	=//		

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The proposed amendments require further considerations not required before the entry of the proposed amendments. The claims were previously drawn to antisense that inhibited a nucleic acid encoding a gne and the claims are now specifically limited to the inhibition of a protein expressed from a specified gene sequence. Claim 19 is now drawn to antisense that "consist essentially of" a specified sequence where the claim was previously much brodaer where the new scope was not specifically addressed, for example..

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The arguments are based on the amendament being entered. However, the examiner would like to point out that claim 1[proposed], for example, does not require the compound be complementary to SEQ ID NO: 28 but only that it inhibit a protein encoded thereby. The prior art [Surmacz] does show this. Upon a brief review of applicant arguments of Surmacz the examiner would point out that either applicant has errored in their analysis of the antisense compound or, perhaps, Surmacz has invertered their control sense oligonucleotide with their antisense oligonucleotide. This is asserted because applicant asserts that the antisense of Surmacz is not antisense to their target, however, the sequence search relied upon by the examiner does. Furthermore, based on applicants analysis, the control oligonucleotide [the sense oligonucleotide] does meet the structural requirements of at least proposed claims 1 and 2 of the instant submission. If applicants analysis is correct then the control oligonucleotide would be applied as art, and if applicants analysis is not, then the art would be applied to the proposed claims as previously applied. The Surmacz reference as well as the other prior art in anycase is properly applied to the claims.